SOME NEW BOOKS.

The Puritans.

One of the most interesting historical books that have been published this year, and, in its special field, the most important since Douglass Campbell's work on "The Puritan in Holland, England, and America," is that now issued by Roberts Bros. under the title *The Puritan in England and New England*, by EZRA HOYT BYINGTON, D. D. Among other aims the author undertakes to correct the confusion current among many educated persons between the Separatists, or Brownists, better known as Pilgrims, who founded the Plymouth colony, and the Puritans, properly so called, who founded the colony of Massachusetts Bay. The difference between these two bodies of emigrants is followed from the origin in Elizabethan England to the union of the two colonies toward the close of the seventeenth century, and an attempt is also made to distinguish between their respective streams of influence in after times. It is this distinction which will mainly occupy us in this notice, but we shall also glance at what the author has to say about the social and domestic life of Puritan New England.

I.

Whence came the name Puritan? How came it to be changed from a term of scorn to one of honor? Where shall the study of the Puritans begin? Certainly not on the coast of Massachusetts. Neither can it begin in Holland, for it was not the Puritans that came thence, but the Separatists. What, then, was the relation of the Separatists on the one hand, and of the Puritans on the other, to the Government and the Church of England? We are led back by these inquiries to events which concerned the history of Europe as a whole no less than of England in particular, as we follow the Puritan idea toward its inception. There were three parties in the Church of England in the reigns of Elizabeth and of James I.: those who were content with things as they were; those who were discontented, but purposed to remain where they were and work out within the Church such reforms as were possible, and those who boldly came out and made a new start, according to what they believed to be an older and a better way. Of these three parties the last named was that of the Separatists, or Brownists, the latter name being derived from the Rev. Robert Browne, a graduate of Cambridge and a relative of Lord Burghley. He published a number of widely read books, in which he set forth his views in regard to the proper constitution of a Christian Church, and he organized the first Separatist Church in England of which there is any definite account. He held that the State, as such, has no ecclesiastical authority, and that the Church should have no connection with the State, except such as grows out of its secular relations. During the reigns of Elizabeth and James the Separatists suffered much persecution, and no fewer than six of them were executed. In the years 1607 and 1608 a considerable number of them, coming mainly from the northern counties, migrated to Holland, whence, in 1620, a part of them set forth to found the Plymouth colony. It is well known that the colony of Massachusetts Bay was started in 1628, at a time when the Puritans proper, who hitherto had not separated from the Church of England, stayed in it, hoping to reform it. This colony received its first great accession of emigrants under Gov. Winthrop in 1630.

Now let us see what Dr. Byington has to tell us about the differences between the founders of these colonies, and then let us examine the question, Which of the two, Plymouth or Massachusetts Bay, has had more to do with the moulding of the people of New England? We have already seen that the two colonies were settled at different times by different sections of the English people and they were not united until 1692, when the so-called Province of Massachusetts was organized. The Pilgrims had come from their life in Holland, where the influence of William the Silent had given a free and tolerant spirit to the earnest Protestants who had stood heroically against the armies of Spain. There is no doubt that their residence in Holland had abiding effects upon the Pilgrims, and, through them, upon New England, though it is possible that Mr. Campbell has somewhat overrated the scope and depth of these effects. Certainly, the Pilgrims could not forget the country where they had found refuge from persecution. They were, as we have said, the disciples of Robert Browne, and they had founded a Separatist Church in their new settlement at Plymouth. The Puritans, on the other hand, were fresh from the great national contest, in the times of Charles I. and Bishop Laud, for the rights which they claimed, as Englishmen, under Magna Charta, a contest which, in 1630, seemed to have been decided against them. They brought with them the principles of Sir John Eliot, John Hampden, and John Pym. They had a dread of Popery, and they believed the Church of England was relapsing into the superstitions of Romanism. Each colony went on for sixty or seventy years developing its political and religious institutions in its own way. In many respects the two colonies were similar; in other respects they were unlike. It was with them much as it had been with the republics of Greece in the best periods of Grecian history. The differences between them, small as well as great, were perpetuated from one generation to another, and if the two colonies had not been welded together in 1692 by the imperial mandate from England, it is likely that the differences between them would have continued, and perhaps become more striking.

II.

We come now to the question, Which of these two colonies has been most efficient in shaping the people of New England? Dr. Byington points out that the earlier historians usually gave the precedence to the Puritans, and that, even in Mr. John C. Palfrey's history, Plymouth occupies but a subordinate place. In later times, however, a higher estimate has been formed of the character and influence of the Pilgrims. Dr. Leonard Bacon, for instance, has written of them as though almost everything that is excellent in the New England character had been derived from them. He has been followed by a number of more recent authors, so that it has become the fashion to ascribe almost every excellence of the New England people to those who came over in the Mayflower. New England families are eager to trace their lineage back to the Pilgrim Fathers. It may be noted as another straw showing the direction of the wind that a great many churches have been named from the Pilgrims and but few in comparison from the Puritans. It is true that the settlement at Plymouth is termed with propriety the Old Colony, because it was begun in 1620, whereas the Puritans did not start their colony at Massachusetts Bay and Salem till eight years later. In a new colony the advantages of a few years in residence count for much. The Pilgrims had a colony well organized, and governed according to democratic principles, and a Church organized after the Congregational way before the Puritans came. It may be that the Puritans would have come to America if the Pilgrims had not been already settled at Plymouth; but it is undeniable that the Puritans were more inclined to make the venture from the fact that a colony of devout Protestant Englishmen had already gained a foothold on the western side of the Atlantic. The Puritans would naturally and, so to speak, inevitably look to the colony at Plymouth for models in the organization of their own State and of their own Church.

Let us look a little more closely at the differences between the pioneers of these two colonies as regards their views of the Church of England. We repeat that the Pilgrims had been Separatists for many years before they came to Plymouth. The Puritans, on the contrary, had had no scruples about the propriety of their connection with the Protestant Church established in England. They could continue, they thought, in its worship and discipline with good consciences, provided it was faithful to the Protestant Reformation. It is abundantly shown in the book before us that their objection was not to the use of the liturgy in public worship, nor to prelatical government. They only objected to certain teachings of the Book of Common Prayer then in use and to certain forms and ceremonies which tended, as they believed, toward the superstitions of the Church of Rome. The Puritans, therefore, so long as they remained in England, claimed their rights as members of the national Church. They refused, indeed, to conform to practices which they regarded as evil, but they claimed the right to worship in the churches of the establishment, and to continue members of the national Church, without conforming to its objectionable usages. Some of the men who came with Gov. Winthrop in 1630 had been church wardens in England. Several of them went back to the Church of England, when they returned to the old country to spend their declining years. It is related that when the ship which carried Mr. Francis Higginson to Salem came to Land's End he called the passengers to take a last view of England, and said: "We will not say, as the Separatists were wont to say, Farewell, Babylon, farewell, Rome; but we will say, Farewell, dear England; farewell, the Church of God in England. We do not go to New England as Separatists from the Church of England, though we cannot but separate from the corruptions of it; but we go to follow the positive part of Church reformation and to propagate the Gospel in America." Again, when Gov. Winthrop was setting out for America with his company they issued an address to their countrymen, which was dated April 7, 1630, and in which they said: "We esteem it an honor to call the Church of England our dear mother, and cannot part from our native country without much sadness of heart and many tears in our eyes. We bless God for our parentage and education as members of the same body, and shall always rejoice in her good. We wish our heads and hearts may be fountains of tears for your everlasting welfare when we shall be in our poor cottages in the wilderness. And so, commending you to the grace of God in Christ, we shall ever remain your assured friends and brethren." It is manifest from these words, which, in Dr. Byington's opinion, were written by the Rev. John White, the Puritan rector of the church in Dorchester, England, that the Puritan emigrants were much less severe in their judgments of the English Church, and, in this respect, at least, more charitable, than were the Pilgrims.

III.

Another point brought out distinctly in this volume is the fact that it was not alone in their relations to the Church of England that the Pilgrims differed from the Puritans. The Pilgrims were, for the most part, people in humble stations of life. A statement made by Gov. Bradford is quoted to the effect that "they were not originally acquainted with trades nor traffic, but had been used to a plain country life and the innocent trade of husbandry." Mr. John C. Palfrey speaks of them as "North country peasants," and he avers that it is not known to this day from what English homes they came. They were people of simple faith, ready to suffer the loss of all things for conscience's sake. When they came to Leyden, they learned such trades or fell into such employments as they preferred. Some were eventually registered as silk merchants, some as wool-carders or as fustian makers, three were printers, one a mason, one a carpenter, one a tailor, one a smith, and five were merchants. It must not be supposed, however, that because the author of this book asserts that the great majority of the persons composing the Plymouth colony came from the humbler walks of life, he forgets that the leaders were really eminent men. On the contrary, he bears witness to the worth and distinction of Gov. Carver, of Gov. Bradford, the historian of the colony, and for thirty years its enterprising and sagacious chief magistrate; of Gov. Winslow, descended from an ancient English family, a gentleman of consummate address, and a born diplomatist; and, finally, of Elder Brewster, a scholar and courtier in early life, and, later, the beloved elder ruler of the Church, and, for many years, while the people were without a minister, the religious teacher of the congregation. Yet, while these exceptions should be recognized, the truth may as well be told that, as compared with the Puritans, the bulk of the Pilgrims came from a lower social stratum.

The Puritans who came to Massachusetts Bay were, for the most part, persons in comfortable circumstances at home, of good education, and with good social connections in England. "The principal planters of Massachusetts," according to Dr. Leonard Bacon, "were English country gentlemen of no inconsiderable fortunes, of enlarged understanding, improved by liberal education." The great Puritan party of England moulded the public opinion of their country during the first half of the seventeenth century. Those who came to New England were fitted by their abilities and training to be the founders of States. An unusual proportion of them were graduates from English universities. Others, who were not graduates, were well read in history and literature and in theology. Their ministers were probably the equals in ability and culture of the clergymen who remained in the Church of England.

IV.

Notwithstanding the facts that the Puritans came over in far greater numbers (their emigration was at the rate of 2,000 a year up to 1640), and that they came from a higher social scale, it is unquestionable that, in respect to the form of organization adopted for their churches, they were controlled by the influence of the Pilgrims. The latter had had a Church organized according to the Congregational way before they came from Leyden. Their pastor, John Robinson, had given them clear and decided views in regard to the pattern of the Church which the New Testament furnishes. It had been agreed that, although the pastor and a large part of the members were to remain in Holland, those who went to America were to constitute an independent Church. In point of fact, the Pilgrim Church at Plymouth was an independent branch of the church in Leyden, and when the Puritans began their colony this independent Pilgrim Church had been in regular existence for a number of years. The Puritans, on the other hand, so far as can be known, had, when they landed, no definite plans for the organization of the Church. It is as clear as anything is in their history that up to that time they had continued members of the Church of England. Their ministers had been ordained as clergymen in the Episcopal Church, and all their ministerial services had been performed therein. The Puritans had pronounced objections to the Separatist churches, and had been unfriendly to the Pilgrims because the latter had broken away entirely from the National Church. Again, if they were themselves to be seceders, or schismatics, their natural affiliations as Protestants and nonconformists would be with the Reformed churches of Geneva and of France and Scotland. In truth, the connection between the English Puritans and the churches of Geneva had been very close for many years. If, then, the former were to break away from the Church of England it would have been the most natural thing in the world for them to follow the method of almost all the Protestant churches, except the Church of England, and to organize according to one of the Presbyterian models. The leading men among the Puritans had been in correspondence with the principal Calvinistic ministers on the Continent, and were familiar with the working of the Calvinistic churches.

The Puritans, however, were hardly an organized colony before they consulted the Pilgrims in regard to the best way of forming a church. Their own bitter experiences in the English Church had prepared them to look with more favor upon the non-prelatical churches. When, for many years, they saw their National Church moving toward the practices and the doctrines of the Romanists, their opinions were gradually modified in respect to the forms of worship and the modes of government in the Established Church. So that the Protestants, who were entirely loyal to the Episcopal Church when James I. became King of England, were prepared to look with favor upon a much simpler organization when they came to New England. The fact that they had left behind the institutions of the old country, and that they were entirely free to carry out their own ideas, had much to do, doubtless, with the change. At the same time, there is decisive evidence that they were guided by the teachings and the experiences of the men of Plymouth. Gov. Winslow, for example, says that "some of the chief of the Puritans advised with us in respect to a right way of worship and desired to know whereupon our practice was grounded. We accordingly showed them," he says, "the primitive practice, taken out of the Acts of the Apostles and Epistles written to the several churches by the said apostles, together with the commandments of Christ, the Lord, in the Gospel, and other our warrant for every particular we did from the Book of God." Endicott, writing to Gov. Bradford from Salem in 1629, thanks him for sending Dr. Fuller to them. He says that he has been satisfied by Dr. Fuller in regard to the outward form of God's worship. This Dr. Fuller was a deacon of the Church of Plymouth. He explained the Plymouth methods of procedure in both civil and church matters; Gov. Endicott accepted his views. This was before the organization of the first church in the Massachusetts colony. In the month of June following this visit of Dr. Fuller three ships arrived at Salem, bringing a large number of passengers. In the ensuing August the first church was formed. A small number of the people at Salem desired to use the Book of Common Prayer; but the great majority preferred to follow the example of the Pilgrim Church at Plymouth and organize after the Congregational way. This first church among the Puritans was almost an exact copy of the Pilgrim Church in Plymouth. "We have come away," they said, "from the Common Prayer and ceremonies in our native land, where we suffered much from nonconformity. In this place of liberty we cannot use them. Their imposition would be a sinful violation of the worship of God." The example of the church in Salem was followed by the churches that were formed within a year or two in Charlestown and Boston. A precedent was thus firmly established, and the churches of the Puritans as well as of the Pilgrims were organized as Independent or Congregational churches.

V.

In respect, also, to the political and social institutions of Massachusetts, the influence of the Old Colony was considerable, especially as time went on. The frame of government therein was, as near as was practicable, a pure democracy. The suffrage was conferred by the freemen upon all whom they deemed worthy of it. It is especially to be noted that there were no religious tests. The Governor was chosen by general suffrage, and the citizens also elected a council of five to advise and assist him. The whole body of adult male inhabitants constituted the Legislature. There could be no law or tax without the consent of the freemen. The general meeting of the freemen of the colony was like a modern town meeting; it is true that, as population increased, a representative system became necessary, and each town in the colony sent its representative to the House of Delegates. The social institutions of the Pilgrims were likewise very simple. The people of the Old Colony lived together on terms of Christian equality. The author of this book, like Mr. Douglass Campbell, recognizes the influence of Holland in these institutions of the Pilgrim Fathers. Their twelve years passed among the stanch defenders of liberty against Spanish bigotry and despotism had given them new ideas in regard to the right of the people to direct the course of government, in regard to the right of suffrage and the organization of the town, and in respect of legislation and of common schools for the people. The Pilgrims, accordingly introduced—this was what Mr. Douglass Campbell aimed to prove—a number of principles which had not, at that time, been accepted in England.

In the Massachusetts colony, on the other hand, we find that, at first, the Puritan emigrants copied the religious institutions of the mother country, and adopted many of its social distinctions. The right of suffrage was restricted to the members of the church in the colony, just as in England the suffrage was limited to communicants in the Church of England. The churches which were recognized by law, that is, the Independent Congregational churches, were supported by a tax upon all the inhabitants, just as in England the Established Church was supported by rates upon the property of all the people of the parish. The Governor and the assistants were chosen by the votes of the freemen of the colony. The deputies to the General Courts were elected by the freemen in each town. It was seriously recommended that members of the Court of Assistants should hold office for life, or until removed for cause. It was, at one time, proposed that a number of the great Puritan noblemen should settle in Massachusetts, with the understanding that they should have a permanent place in the Government, and that their rank should be hereditary. The fact that these proposals were made shows one of the tendencies that the Puritans brought with them. These tendencies, however, as time went on, were not permitted to control the colony. The democratic principles of the people, reënforced by the example of Plymouth, asserted themselves even in the earlier years. Eminent public men like Gov. Winthrop learned from experience that they had no secure tenure of official position, except so long as they carried out the will of those who had elected them. It is an error to suppose that either the ministers or the more conspicuous citizens had the control of the colony. There were instances, even in the earlier years, when these natural leaders were outvoted and set aside in a political election.

VI.

In respect, finally, of numbers and wealth the two colonies were very unlike. When the Old Colony was four years old, it contained only thirty-two cabins, inhabited by one hundred and eighty persons. Six years later it numbered three hundred. Even five years after this, when the colony was fifteen years old, it had only five hundred people. At the end of seventy-two years, when it was absorbed in the province of Massachusetts, it had only eight thousand inhabitants, so slow was its growth. Small as it always was, however, the Old Colony has exerted an influence out of all proportion to its numbers. The steadfast faith of its people, their patience under adversity, their boldness in crossing the sea with limited numbers and scanty resources, the motives which inspired the enterprise—"that we might enjoy liberty of conscience" and "keep our own language and the name of Englishmen," and "train our children as we were trained," and "enlarge the Church of Christ"—and, besides all this, their gentleness and charity toward those who differed with them, their comparative freedom from the spirit of persecution, their comparative tolerance in a century of intolerance, all these things have won for them everywhere sympathy and admiration. So much as this is heartily conceded by Dr. Byington to the Pilgrim Fathers. Nevertheless he holds that the clear-headed student of New England history will find that, after all, the elements of vigorous growth and permanent influence were in the Puritan colony rather than in the colony at Plymouth. The number of Pilgrims in Holland when the Mayflower sailed for America was not much more than three hundred; those who remained behind were, therefore, a small company from which to recruit a colony. On the other hand, when the Puritans crossed the sea, a large part of England, if not, as Dr. Byington thinks, the larger part, was Puritan. Twelve years after the beginning of the Puritan settlements the colony of Massachusetts Bay had more than twenty thousand people. In that time the Puritan emigrants had planted fifty towns and villages, built thirty or forty churches and a larger number of ministers' houses, a castle, forts, roads, and a prison—all at their own charges. They were living in comfortable dwellings, surrounded with gardens, orchards, cornfields and well-fenced meadows. They had founded Harvard College, and were taxing themselves for its support. Colonies had already gone out from them to begin settlements on the Connecticut River at Springfield and at Hartford, and also at New Haven and in Rhode Island and in New Hampshire. This is, indeed, a marvellous record of material growth for a colony separated from the mother country by the width of the Atlantic. The contrast was quite as marked in the intellectual expansion of the two colonies. During the first fifty years of the history of Plymouth there was a singular lack of permanence in the ministry of that town. As late as 1666 the Royal Commissioners reported that they found in the Plymouth colony "only twelve small towns," and that the people were so poor that "they were not able to maintain scholars to their ministers, but were necessitated to make use of a gifted brother in some places." Dr. Byington points out, however, that there were at that time at least five university men settled within the borders of the Old Colony. It is certain, however, that a very different state of things existed in the colony of Massachusetts Bay even in its earliest years, when Higginson, Cotton, Norton, Hooker, Mather, Sheppard, and their associates were the intellectual leaders of the people, as well as their spiritual guides. Some of them had carried off honors in the English universities. This striking difference in respect of the qualifications of the ministers bears witness to a great disparity in the financial resources of the people of the two colonies, and, possibly, a difference in the average intelligence of the two communities. Scarcely were the Puritans settled on the shores of Massachusetts Bay when they began to put forth books and pamphlets which were published, at first, in London, and later in Salem and Boston. The literature of the first half century is creditable not only to the authors, but to the readers who were able to follow such close and logical thinking. In a word, Boston and Cambridge were as truly the intellectual centres of New England in the seventeenth century as they are in the nineteenth. Harvard College was an important means of influence, and it doubtless had much to do with the preëminence of the younger colony.

At the same time, it would be possible to give too much weight to the superiority of the Puritans in numbers and wealth, and in intellectual and social culture. The energy, the enterprise, the political sagacity, and the genius for creating new types of government—these are the inheritance of New England from the Puritan fathers. On the other hand, the beauty and the poetry of New England have come, in great part, from those who landed on Plymouth Rock. They have taught the world a larger tolerance and gentler manners, and have given the example of purer laws. The Pilgrims had been purified by the fires of a fearful persecution. They had learned lessons of patience and of gentleness in the hard school of adversity. The death penalty was never inflicted upon Quakers in the Old Colony, and, although there were two trials for witchcraft, the charges were declared not proven.

VII.

Life in New England was less democratic in the colonial period than it is in our times, many of the class distinctions of the mother country having been transferred to the new community. Only twelve of those who came over in the Mayflower had the title Mr. affixed to their name. The others were plain John Alden, Thomas Williams, &c. The prefix Mr. and Mrs. was given only to those who had belonged to the class of gentlemen in England, and also to ministers and physicians and their wives. Goodman and goodwife were the appropriate terms with which to address persons who were below the condition of gentility, and yet above that of servants. Most of the deputies to the General Court were designated by their names only, unless they had a military title. A gentleman might be deprived of his rank for a disgraceful act. It was ordered by the Court in 1631 that one Josias Plastowe should be fined five pounds for stealing corn from the Indians, and that hereafter he should be called by the name of Josias, and not Mr., as formerly he had been. These distinctions in social rank were carefully preserved in the early catalogues of Harvard College. Those who had been graduated from college were entitled to be addressed as Sir, until they had received the degree of Master of Arts, when their proper title was Mr. People were sometimes seated in the meeting house, according to their social rank. Conventional distinctions, however, gradually faded away, and the tendency was toward equality, as it always is in a new country. The dress of the people during the colonial period was generally plain, as well because of their limited resources as because it was the policy of the colony to discourage habits of extravagance. Yet those in official positions were continually passing to and from England, and it was necessary for them to maintain the style and manners of gentlemen of their rank in the old country. Professional men and public officers were expected to wear a distinctive dress. The typical Puritan, as we see him in the old portraits, looks like a man of considerable distinction. The fact that laws against extravagance in dress were needed shows that human nature in the times of the Puritans was very much what it is now. Their young people had a love for beautiful things, and sought to adorn themselves, even beyond their means. In 1634 it was necessary to enact that "no person, either man or woman, should hereafter make or buy any apparel that hath lace in it, or silver and gold." Still later it was enacted that no one should wear embroidered caps, gold and silver girdles, immoderate great sleeves, or slashed apparel. We read in the records of the Plymouth colony of a man who created a sensation by appearing in the streets of Plymouth in long red silk stockings. The "Simple Cobbler of Agawam" complains of five or six extravagant women who inquire, he says, "what dress the Queen is in this week," and "what is the very newest fashion of the court," and who "egg to be in it in all haste, whatever it be."

Dr. Byington gives some interesting specimens of the inventories of the estates of persons in the best condition of life in Boston twenty years after the town was settled. The inventory of the household goods of Gov. Winthrop sums up the value of £103. This included several feather beds and bolsters, a down bed, pillows, and bolsters, a large number of pewter dishes and plates, tin plates, brass and copper kettles, brass candlesticks, brass and iron andirons, some old armor, firearms, several small carpets, cushions, cloaks, a cloth-of-gold scarf, tablecloths, napkins, a large number of chairs, tables, cabinets and chests, two suits of clothes, six pairs of spectacles, and many other things. There is also preserved in the records of the colony of Massachusetts an inventory of the household goods of Mrs. Martha Coytmore, who afterward became the fourth wife of Gov. Winthrop. The whole value of the estate of her first husband seems to have been about £1,300. One hundred and twenty-seven pounds was represented by the household furniture. The items are much the same as those in the inventory of the Governor's furniture; some articles, however, were more expensive. There was a cypress chest worth £2 10s.; diaper tablecloths, with napkins, worth several pounds; a silk red and green bed quilt, striped curtains, and some siver plate worth £15.

VIII.

The amusements of a plain people dwelling in the wilderness would naturally be few and simple. Yet the Puritans seem to have had more recreation than some writers would lead us to suppose. It is true that games of chance were prohibited by law, and so was dancing. There is, nevertheless, abundant evidence that there was a hearty and not ungenial social life among the first settlers of the New England colonies. Travellers of that period who visited New England do not speak of the life they found there as a gloomy one. The people had their own simple rustic amusements, such as those to which they had been accustomed in the mother country. One of the examples given is the first harvest festival of Plymouth, when a whole week seems to have been given up to sports and a succession of merrymakings, as well as to the entertainment of the Indians. The commencement week at Harvard College was always interesting. We read of a great training on Boston Common, which brought together the people from the various settlements. Many gentlemen and gentlewomen dined in tents on the Common. Judge Sewell in his diary (made, of course, at a considerably later epoch), refers very often to the dinner parties which he attended, and tells us something of the bill of fare. On the whole, Nathaniel Hawthorne was right in saying that the generation which followed the early emigrants, the generation which had never mingled in the sports of old England, wore the darkest shade of Puritanism.

We can estimate the social and family life of the Puritans from its results in the types of character which we find in their descendants. We are living among people of the eighth generation from the founders of New England. That is a long period through which to transmit distinctive traits. Nevertheless, the New England type of mind, after 270 years, is still almost as distinct in the great stream of American life as is the Gulf Stream in the Atlantic. The Puritan type is very persistent. The men and women of Puritan blood, wherever we find them, are apt to be people of vigorous intellect, thrifty habits, inventive genius, and strong moral character. They stand for liberty in the Church and in the State. The leaders of liberal thought and also a large proportion of the conservative leaders have been descendants of the Puritans. No other section of the Anglo-Saxon race has excelled the Puritans in the number of great men, and of good men, scholars and statesmen, and soldiers, that it has produced.

M. W. H.

The German Revolution of 1848.

It is obvious enough that, as a rule, nobody would think of reprinting in book form the correspondence published in a daily newspaper. The conditions under which the work is done would generally deprive it of permanent value in the estimation of the writer himself. It is equally certain that no one will contest the validity of the exception presented in the little volume entitled *Revolution and Counter-Revolution, or Germany in 1848*, by KARL MARX (Scribner). This book undoubtedly contains materials for history which ought to be preserved. As an eyewitness of many of the events which he describes, and as an actor in some of them, the author speaks with peculiar authority, aside from his undisputed qualifications as a learned and acute observer. The series of letters which is here reprinted was originally contributed to the *New York Tribune* in the years 1851-52, and was then justly denominated in an editorial note one of the most instructive sources of information on the great questions of European politics. Every one of the twenty chapters in the volume deserves careful perusal, and we can only exemplify their value by directing special attention to the three which deal with the Vienna insurrection and with the final overthrow of liberal government in that capital.

I.

It is pointed out that the revolution in Vienna may be said to have been effected by an almost unanimous population. The bourgeoisie (with the exception of the bankers and stock jobbers), the petty trading class, and the working people, one and all, arose at once against the government of Metternich, a government so universally detested that the small minority of nobles and money lords which had supported it made itself invisible on the very first attack. The middle classes had been kept in such a degree of political ignorance by Metternich that to them the news from Paris about the reign of anarchy, socialism, and terror, and about impending struggles between the class of capitalists and the class of laborers, proved quite unintelligible. They, in their political innocence, either could attach no meaning to such news, or they believed it to be an invention of Metternich to frighten them into obedience. It is further to be noted that they had never seen workingmen acting as a class, or standing up for their own distinct class interests. They had from their past experience no idea of the possibility of any differences springing up between classes that now were so heartily united in upsetting a government hated by all. They saw the working people agree with themselves upon all points, namely, a constitution, trial by jury, liberty of the press, &c. Thus they were, in March, 1848, at least heart and soul with the movement, and the movement at once constituted then, at least in theory, the predominant class in the State. Practically, however, the supremacy of the middle class was far from being established. It is true that, by the organization of a National Guard, which gave arms to the bourgeoisie and petty tradesmen, that class obtained both force and importance; it is true, also, that, by the installation of a "Committee of Safety," a sort of revolutionary, irresponsible body of governors in which the bourgeoisie predominated, it was placed at the head of affairs. At the same time the working classes were partially armed, too; they and the students had borne the brunt of the fight, so far as there had been a fight; and the students grouped in their Academic Legion, about four thousand strong, armed, and far better disciplined than the National Guard, formed the nucleus of the revolutionary party, and were by no means willing to act as a mere instrument in the hands of the "Committee of Safety." The workingmen, on their part, almost entirely thrown out of employment, had to be employed in public works at the expense of the State, and the money for this purpose had, of course, to be taken out of the purse of the taxpayer, or out of the chest of the city of Vienna. All this, of course, could not fail to become, in time, very unpleasant to the Viennese tradesman. Again, the manufactures of the city, calculated for the consumption of a rich and aristocratic court, were inevitably stopped by the revolution, through the flight of the aristocracy and the members of the imperial family; trade was at a standstill, and the continuous agitation kept up by the students and working people was not the way to "restore confidence," as the phrase went. Thus a certain coolness very soon sprang up between the middle classes on the one side and the turbulent students and working people on the other; and if, for a considerable time, this coolness did not ripen into open hostility, it was because the Ministry, and particularly the court, in their impatience to restore the old order of things, constantly justified the suspicion and the turbulent activity of the more revolutionary parties, and constantly caused the spectre of the old Metternichian despotism to arise before the eyes of the middle classes.

II.

So much about the genesis of the Viennese insurrection. In another letter Karl Marx shows how the high aristocracy and the stock-jobbing bourgeoisie, which had formed the principal nonofficial support of the Metternich government, were enabled, even after the events of March, 1848, to maintain a preponderating influence over the Government, not only by means of the court, the army, and the bureaucracy, but still more, through the horror of "anarchy," which ultimately awakened and then spread rapidly among the middle classes. The reactionists soon ventured a few feelers in the shape of a press law, a nondescript aristocratic constitution, and an electoral law based upon the old division of "estates." The so-called constitutional Ministry, consisting of semi-Liberal, timid, incapable bureaucrats, on the 14th of May, 1848, ventured even a direct attack upon the revolutionary organization of the masses by dissolving the central committee of delegates from the National Guard and Academic Legion, a body formed for the express purpose of controlling the Government, and of calling out against it, in case of need, the popular forces. But this act on the part of the Ministry only provoked the insurrection of May 15, by which the Government was forced to acknowledge the committee, to repeal the constitution and the electoral law, and to grant the power of framing a new fundamental law through a Constitutional Diet elected by universal suffrage. All this was confirmed on the following day by an imperial proclamation. The reactionary party, however, which had its representatives in the Ministry, soon got their "liberal" colleagues to undertake a new attack upon the representatives of the more popular party. The Academic Legion, the stronghold of the Progressists and the centre of continuous agitation, had on this account become obnoxious to the more moderate burghers of Vienna; so it came to pass that on May 26 a Ministerial decree dissolved it. Perhaps this blow might have succeeded if it had been delivered by a part of the National Guards only, but the Government, not trusting them either, brought the military forward, and at once the National Guards turned round, united with the Academic Legion, and thus frustrated the Ministerial project.

III.

In the mean time the Emperor and his court had, on May 16, left Vienna and fled to Innspruck. Here, surrounded by the bigoted and loyal Tyroleans, the counter-revolutionary party found an asylum, whence, uncontrolled, unobserved, and safe, it might rally its scattered forces and spread again all over the country the network of its plots. Communications were reopened with Radetzky, in Italy, with Jellachich, the Ban of Croatia, and with Windischgrätz, commanding the army operating in Bohemia, as well as with trustworthy men in the administrative hierarchy of the different provinces. Thus a real force, at the disposal of the counter-revolutionary camarilla, was created, while the impotent Ministers in Vienna were allowed to wear out their popularity in continual bickerings with the revolutionary masses and in the debates of the forthcoming Constituent Assembly. In Vienna, too, the middle class, persuaded that, after three successive defeats, and in the face of a Constituent Assembly based upon universal suffrage, the court was no longer an opponent to be dreaded, fell, more and more, into the weariness and apathy and into the craving for order and tranquillity which, always and everywhere, seizes this class of citizens after violent commotion and the consequent derangement of trade. The clamor for a return to a regular system of government and for a return of the court, both of which were expected to bring about a revival of commercial prosperity, soon became general among the middle classes. The meeting of the Constituent Assembly or Diet in July, 1848, was hailed with delight as the end of the revolutionary era; so was the return of the court, which, after the victories of Radetzky in Italy, and after the advent of the reactionary Ministry of Doblhoff, considered itself strong enough to brave the popular torrent. Moreover, the court needed to be in Vienna, in order to complete its intrigues with the Slavonic majority of the Constitutional Convention. While this Convention, otherwise known as the Constituent Diet, discussed laws for the emancipation of the peasantry from feudal bondage and from forced labor for the nobility, the court undertook to effect a master stroke. On Aug. 19, 1848, the Emperor reviewed the National Guard; and the imperial family, the courtiers, and the general officers outdid each other in flattery to the armed burghers, who were already intoxicated with pride at seeing themselves publicly acknowledged as one of the important bodies of the State. Immediately afterward a decree signed by Herr Schwarzer, the only popular Minister in the Cabinet, was published, withdrawing the Government aid which had been hitherto given to the workmen out of employ. The trick succeeded; the working classes got up a protesting demonstration; the middle class National Guards declared for the decree of their Ministers; they were launched upon the unarmed and unresisting work people, and they massacred a great number of them on the 23d of August. Thus the unity and strength of the revolutionary force was broken; the class struggles between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat had come in Vienna to a bloody outbreak, as it had come in Paris in the days of June of the same year, and the counter-revolutionary camarilla saw the day approaching on which it might deal a deadly blow.

IV.

It is noteworthy that the pretext for the suppression of the German revolution in Vienna was afforded by an exhibition of sympathy with the Hungarians. On Oct. 5, 1848, an imperial decree was published in the *Vienna Gazette*, a decree countersigned by none of the responsible Ministers for Hungary, which declared the Hungarian Diet dissolved and named Jellachich, Ban of Croatia, Civil and Military Governor of the Hungarians. At the same time orders were given to the troops in Vienna to march out and form part of the army which was to enforce Jellachich's authority. This, however, was showing the cloven foot too openly; every man in Vienna felt that war upon Hungary was war upon the principle of constitutional government, which principle was trampled upon by the Emperor's attempt to give decrees legal force, without the countersign of responsible Ministers. The working people, the Academic Legion, and the National Guard of Vienna rose *en masse* on Oct. 6, and resisted the departure of the troops; some grenadiers passed over to the people; a short struggle took place between the popular forces and the soldiers; the Minister of War, Latour, was massacred by the people, and in the evening the latter were victors. In the mean time, Jellachich, beaten by the Hungarians in a battle at Stuhlweissenburg, had taken refuge near Vienna, on German-Austrian territory; the Viennese troops that were to march to his support now took up an ostensibly hostile and offensive position against him; and the Emperor and court fled once more, this time to Olmutz on semi-Slavonic territory. Here the court found itself in a much more favorable position than it had occupied at Innspruck, for a campaign against the revolution. It was surrounded by the Slavonian Deputies of the Constituent Diet, and by Slavonian enthusiasts from all parts of the monarchy. The campaign, in their eyes, was to be a war for Slavonian restoration against the two intruders on Slavonian soil, namely, the German and Magyar. Windischgrätz was made the commander of the army that was now rapidly concentrated around Vienna. From Bohemia, Moravia, Styria, Upper Austria, and Italy marched regiment after regiment, on converging routes, to join the troops of Jellachich and the ex-garrison of the capital. About 60,000 men were thus united toward the end of October, and soon they began to hem in the imperial city on all sides, until, on Oct. 30, 1848, they were far enough advanced to venture upon a decisive attack.

V.

In Vienna, in the mean time, confusion and helplessness prevailed. The middle class, as soon as the victory had been gained on Oct. 6, became again possessed of their old distrust of the working classes; the workingmen, on their part, mindful of the treatment they had received six weeks before (Aug. 23) at the hands of the armed tradesmen, and of the wavering policy of the middle class at large, would not intrust to them the defence of the city, and demanded arms and military organization for themselves. The Academic Legion, although full of zeal for the struggle against imperial despotism, was entirely incapable of understanding the causes of the estrangement of the two classes, or of otherwise comprehending the exigencies of the situation. There was confusion in the public mind, confusion in the ruling council. The remnant of the Deputies to the Constituent Diet, who were mainly German, but included a few Slavonians, acting the part of spies for their friends at Olmutz, besides a few of the more revolutionary Polish deputies, sat in permanence; but instead of playing a resolute part they wasted their time in idle debates touching the possibility of resisting the imperial army without overstepping the bounds of constitutional conventionality. The Committee of Safety, composed of deputies from almost all the popular bodies of Vienna, although determined to resist, was yet dominated by a majority of burghers and petty tradesmen, who never allowed it to follow up any determined, energetic line of action. The council of the Academic Legion passed heroic resolutions, but was in nowise able to take the lead. The working classes, distrusted, disarmed, disorganized, scarcely delivered from the intellectual bondage of the old régime, and scarcely awakened, not to a knowledge, but even to a mere instinct of their social position and proper political line of action, could only make themselves heard by loud demonstrations and could not be expected to be equal to the difficulties of the moment. Nevertheless, they were ready, as they were at all times in Germany during the revolution of 1848, to fight to the last, as soon as they obtained arms. Such was the state of things in Vienna. Outside was the reorganized Austrian army, flushed with the victories of Radetzky in Italy. Sixty or seventy thousand men were armed, well disciplined, and, if not well commanded, at least possessing commanders of a sort. Inside, confusion, class division, disorganization: a National Guard, part of which had resolved not to fight at all, while a part was irresolute, and only the smallest part was ready to act; a proletarian mass, powerful by numbers, but without leaders, without any political education, subject to panic, as well as to fits of fury, almost without cause, a prey to every false rumor spread abroad, quite ready to fight, but unarmed, at least in the beginning, and incompletely armed and badly organized when, at last, they were led to battle; a helpless Diet, discussing theoretical quibbles, while the roof over their heads was almost burning; a leading committee without the impulse or the energy to lead. Everything was changed from the days of March and May in the same year ('48), when, in the counter-revolutionary camp, all was confusion and bewilderment, and when the only organized force was that created by the Revolution. There could hardly be a doubt about the issue of such a struggle, and, whatever doubt there might be, was settled by the events of the 30th and 31st October and 1st November.

VI.

When, at last, on Oct. 30, the concentrated army of Windischgrätz began the attack on Vienna, the forces that could be brought forward in defence were glaringly insufficient for the purpose. Of the National Guard, as we have said, only a portion could be brought to the intrenchments. A proletarian guard, it is true, had at last been hastily formed, but, owing to the lateness of the attempt to make available the most numerous, daring, and energetic part of the population, it was too little inured to the use of arms and to the rudiments of discipline to offer a successful resistance. Thus the Academic Legion, three to four thousand strong, well exercised, and disciplined to a certain degree, brave and enthusiastic, was, militarily speaking, the only force which was in a state to do its work successfully. But what did they amount to, even when supplemented by the few trustworthy National Guards, and by the disorderly mass of armed proletarians, in opposition to the far more numerous regulars of Windischgrätz, not counting the brigand hordes of Jellachich, hordes that were, however, by the nature of their habits, very useful in a war from house to house and from lane to lane? The insurgents possessed but a few old, outworn, ill-mounted, and ill-served pieces of ordnance to oppose to the numerous and well-appointed artillery of which Windischgrätz made an unscrupulous use.

The nearer the danger grew the deeper grew the confusion in Vienna. The Diet, up to the last moment, could not collect sufficient energy to call to its aid the Hungarian army of Perczel, encamped a few leagues below the capital. The Committee of Safety passed contradictory resolutions, they themselves being, like the popular armed masses, floated up and down with the alternately rising and receding tide of rumors and counter rumors. There was only one thing upon which all were agreed, namely, to respect property. This was done, it seems, to a degree almost ludicrous for such times. As to the final arrangement of the plan of defence, very little was attempted. Bem, the only man present who could have saved Vienna, if any one could then have done it, an almost unknown foreigner, a Slavonian by birth, gave up the task, overwhelmed, as he was, by universal distrust. Had he persevered, he might have been lynched as a traitor. Messenhauser, the commander of the insurgent forces, more of a novel writer than even of a subaltern officer, was totally inadequate to the undertaking. Yet, after eight months of revolutionary struggles, the popular party had not produced or won over a military man of more ability than he. Thus the contest began. The Viennese, considering their utterly insufficient means of defence, and considering also the utter absence of military skill and organization in their ranks, offered a most heroic resistance. In many cases the order given by Bem, when he was in command, "to defend that post to the last man," was carried out to the letter. But force prevailed. Barricade after barricade was swept away by the imperial artillery in the long and wide avenues which formed the main streets of the suburbs, and on the evening of the second day's fighting the Croats occupied the range of houses facing the glacis of the Old Town. A feeble, isolated, and disorderly attack of the Hungarian army had been entirely defeated; and during an armistice, while some parties in the Old Town capitulated, while others hesitated and spread confusion, and while the remnants of the Academic Legion prepared fresh intrenchments, an entrance was made by the imperialists, and, in the midst of the general disorder, the Old Town was carried.

The immediate consequences of this victory, the brutalities and executions by martial law, the unheard of cruelties and infamies committed by the Slavonian hordes let loose upon Vienna, are well known. The ulterior consequences, the entirely new turn given to German affairs by the defeat of the revolution in Vienna, are set forth in the letters of Karl Marx to the *Tribune*, but for these we must refer the reader to this interesting and valuable volume.

AS TO FERRYBOAT SUICIDES.

New Light From Weehawken Upon the Curious Ways of Women.

It is one thing to get an assignment to write a story. It is another thing to find a man who will tell a story that will be readable.

A SUN reporter had an assignment to interview some man at a ferry, and ask him how many people he had seen jump from ferryboats into the river; how many were women and how many were men; how many more jumped in the afternoon than in the morning; how many more jumped in the evening; and why those who did jump always made the leap from the crowded end of the boat where the chances of rescue were greater than they would be aft where no one is present.

If Mr. Depew were a ferryman he would have had data at hand that would have made an interesting story. But your average ferryman is not a Depew.

The reporter had to do the best he could with the material at hand. He went to a half dozen ferries and asked these questions, but the responses were not encouraging. The only one who showed a disposition to be accommodating was one who is on watch on the Weehawken line. A fellow of infinate jest, but he does not know it.

"How many people have you seen jump from the ferries on this line?" he was asked.

"This year?"

"Yes, this year will do as well as any."

"Lemme see. I don't believe I've seen any jump this year."

"Well, last year."

"I wasn't here last year."

"Where were you—if you were at any ferry?"

"Fulton street."

"How many did you see jump from Fulton street ferries?"

"Never saw any."

"Please state, from any ferries where you have worked, how many you ever saw jump?"

"Well, I never counted 'em."

"Did you ever see any?"

"Oh, yes. I've seen some. But as I said, I never counted 'em."

"Have you seen more men than women jump?"

"Wimmen's more on the jump than men, as far as I can recollect. Are you interviewin' me for the papers?"

"Yes."

"Well, make it wimmen, then. I think I have seen more wimmen jump than men. I don't think I ever see but one man jump, come to think of it, and he didn't jump. Only tried to."

"Well, let that one go. Now about the women. Do they jump mostly in the afternoon, the morning, or the evening?"

"Oh, you can't tell anything about that. You never can tell when a woman is going to jump overboard. She is just as likely to jump in the middle of the day."

"From the forward end of the boat, generally?"

"Generally, yes. Where the crowd is. They like to hear people holler, and get up excitement."

"Then you think it is for effect—that they do not really want to drown?"

"Sure. Why we fished out a woman onct, that had life preservers on her. Not on this line, though. I reckon somebody's been stringin' you. S'pose you think that most anybody'd ruther jump in the river than to get off at Weehawken. But that ain't so. Weehawken ain't a bad town to live in when you're onct acquainted there. Purty good society in Weehawken."

"How many women have you rescued, of those who have jumped overboard?"

"Only that one I told you about."

"The others were lost?"

"Oh, I don't know. You never can tell. Now, if a man jumps over and goes down, and you don't see him come up, the chances is that he's a goner. But a woman'll jump over, and stay under, and get her name and picter in the papers, and make a lot of trouble in the family, and get up a mystery, and about the time the flowers is bought for the funeral, she'll turn up all right, and get the rake off."

"The what?"

"The rake off—the flowers and the emblems of mournin', and the kiss and the make up. Reckon you don't know much about wimmen. You'd better write up somethin' else. There ain't nothin' in this business you've been askin' about."